



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/761,830	LUTZ, DAVID J.
	Examiner Christine T. Cajilig	Art Unit 3637

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Christine T. Cajilig.

(3) Ms. Christine McLeod.

(2) Jose V. Chen.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 28 June 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 12.

Identification of prior art discussed: Hernandez, Lutz, Howson.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Proposed draft of claim 12 was discussed in terms of 112 2nd and how it overcomes prior art. The proposed language of claim 12 appears to overcome the 112 2nd rejection and clarifies that the claim is directed only to the pipe protector per se. Hernandez, Lutz, and Howson were discussed as not having holes in the sleeves, lacking a gap, or being unable to have holes placed in the sleeve, respectively. However, the emphasis of the "gap bounded by the tubular sleeve, the conical neck, and the ventilation pipe" does not appear to overcome the structure of the prior art as this limitation depends on the presence of the ventilation pipe. The Examiner suggests claiming specific features of the protector that could stand alone and distinguish it from the prior art or claiming the combination of the protector and the ventilation pipe. Nonetheless, arguments and amendments will be considered upon filing.